

□ 1215

## REMEMBERING MAINI WOOD

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of a great Ohioan, Maini Wood, who recently passed away at her York Township homestead.

Maini lived an incredible life. She was born in Finland in 1930 and survived the Russo-Finnish War of 1939 and 1940.

As a young girl, she actually had to ski to school, wearing white robes to hide from the Russian bombers that flew overhead.

Maini immigrated to the United States in her early 20s, but she met her husband, Dee, aboard a ship during a visit to her native Finland. The couple eventually settled in York Township where they raised their children in what they described as—and I happen to agree with them—a beautiful, idyllic rural community.

We learned so much from Maini about survival, about taking chances, and about finding joy in life's simple pleasures.

Ohio and America are less with her loss.

My thoughts and prayers are with Maini's family as they grieve the loss of this amazing woman.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1402

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTHRIE) at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

## TERMINATING CDC REQUIREMENT FOR PROOF OF COVID-19 VACCINATION FOR FOREIGN TRAVELERS

## GENERAL LEAVE

MR. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 185.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 97 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 185.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1402

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes, with Mr. KILEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) to begin debate.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 185, which provides another opportunity to recognize COVID-19 as an endemic and move our country back to normal.

Last week, we had a couple of bills dealing with COVID—one vaccine mandate for healthcare workers, which is the only CMS vaccine mandated for healthcare workers—and my bill to declare the emergency over.

President Biden actually did announce that the emergency is going to be over May 11, so we have a lot of work to do moving forward.

Now we move forward to ask for support for H.R. 185, which provides another opportunity for us to move our country back to normal.

H.R. 185, introduced by Mr. MASSIE, a member of the Rules Committee and a fellow Kentuckian, would finally put an end to the CDC's requirement for international travelers to show proof of COVID-19 vaccination before entering the United States through air, through flying to this country.

The bill would also prevent the CDC from implementing any similar mandates to show proof of COVID-19 vaccination to enter into the United States through air.

This policy is out of touch with the rest of the world. The U.S. is the only country in North America with this requirement, and most other countries have no testing or vaccination requirements at all. Also, the Biden administration fails to provide exceptions for religious or moral reasons.

As with other vaccine mandates, this requirement will not end on May 11,

and thus far, the administration has not indicated any plans to change it.

It is long past due to end this mandate. Doing so will align the United States with the rest of North America's COVID-19 vaccine policy for people coming into the country and recognize COVID-19 is an endemic rather than a pandemic.

Further, this will serve as an important check and balance against President Biden's overreaching policies by requiring the President to come to Congress in order to enact similar policies in the future.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 185, which once again prioritizes politics over science at the expense of the health of the American people.

To date, COVID-19 has killed more than 1 million of our fellow Americans. Families have been changed forever. Fortunately, today we have vaccines, tests, and treatments that have put the darkest days of the pandemic behind us, but we can't forget that COVID still kills 500 Americans every day.

Variants of concern continue to emerge, and therefore we must be vigilant and data driven in monitoring any uptick in cases. We must follow the science and the guidance of our public health experts.

We are not done with COVID; or, rather, COVID is not done with us. Ending all of our protections and public health measures without a reasoned discussion is downright dangerous. Unfortunately, that is exactly what House Republicans continue to do week after week, bringing bills to the floor that are nothing but political stunts that put politics over science. This is the latest dangerous stunt.

H.R. 185 would terminate the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's order that requires proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign air passengers entering the United States.

Vaccination is protective against severe illness and death from COVID-19. It reduces the impact of COVID-19 on our healthcare infrastructure, including hospital capacity and healthcare provider staffing. That is why the CDC order was put in place and why I continue to believe that our public health experts are best positioned to make these kinds of determinations.

This bill would permit unvaccinated individuals to freely enter the United States, even as variants continue to emerge around the world, potentially increasing the risk of circulating new variants of concern. This could potentially stretch our healthcare resources just as our hospitals, providers, and public health infrastructure try to rebuild.

In addition, H.R. 185 would also prohibit the CDC from issuing any successor or subsequent orders to require COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers in the future as well. This is dangerous and ties the hands of our public

health experts to the political whims of the most ideologically extreme in a way that makes our Nation less safe and more vulnerable in the future.

Imagine if a dangerous new variant that was highly contagious appeared somewhere in the world. This Republican bill would prevent the CDC from restricting people from entering the Nation who are not vaccinated. This simply defies logic, but it is, unfortunately, what happens when you have an extreme Republican majority that is more interested in rushing these bills to the floor as political stunts without any consideration of the implications.

There have been no committee hearings to hear from experts on what this bill could mean for the American people, and without any input from Democratic Members, who remain willing to have reasoned discussions about moving beyond the immediate emergency of COVID-19.

This is also the second bill in just 2 weeks in which Republicans have sought to question the safety and efficacy of the COVID vaccines, despite the unequivocal scientific consensus that COVID-19 vaccination is protective against severe illness and death.

Mr. Chairman, I have now sat through two Rules Committee debates and two floor debates in the House of Representatives where some Republicans have sought to undermine vaccine confidence and contend that vaccines aren't safe and effective. This is extremely dangerous.

It is also deeply disappointing that we have to continue to have these discussions instead of coming together to encourage all Americans to get their vaccinations to protect themselves and their loved ones against severe illness.

That is why I am also disappointed that the Rules Committee and its Republican majority barred consideration of an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) which would have made clear that nothing in this bill shall be construed to cast doubt on the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines. This would have sent a strong message for us to come together on a bipartisan basis and make clear that this bill is not intended to disparage vaccines and that the House of Representatives stands in support of science and reason.

It is telling that the Rules Committee decided not to make this amendment in order. It is a sad sign that my Republican colleagues continue to cater to the most extremist members of their Conference who would rather spread COVID misinformation than come together to encourage vaccination as our best path out of this pandemic.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats understand that we are entering a new phase of our response to COVID-19 and believe it is reasonable to reconsider some of the pandemic-related policies and whether they are still necessary.

Instead of rushing partisan bills like this to the floor, we are willing to have

bipartisan conversations on a path forward. However, we will never—and I stress never—call into question the safety and efficacy of vaccines. We will not undermine the expertise of our public health officials or put politics over science.

Unfortunately, this bill does just that. For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my good friend, to speak on the bill. We have the great privilege of sharing Bardstown in Nelson County in our districts.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear the other side of the aisle talk about logic. What we are talking about today is whether to repeal the vaccine mandate on international travelers. Well, what is the logic of having a vaccine mandate on legal international travelers but not on the millions of people who are pouring across our border? Where is the logic in that? I don't see any logic.

It is time for us to join the rest of the free world. You want a list of countries that don't have this mandate? Australia, Japan, Mexico, Canada, Spain, Germany, France, Ukraine. I could go on and on. Am I memorizing a list of countries? No. I am telling you basically all of the countries in the world. In fact, dictatorships have already gotten rid of this vaccine mandate: Russia, Syria, China. Cuba even doesn't have this draconian xenophobic measure at the border.

Let's talk about the State of the Union Address last night. The President said: Today COVID no longer controls our lives. Gee, I wish that were true. I wish that were true.

Here is a letter I received—now, it is from a foreigner who is related to Americans: Dear sir, I am an Australian. My daughter married an American in September of 2020. My wife and I were not allowed to visit for the wedding. Subsequently, due to the U.S. ban on unvaccinated arrivals, I have not seen my daughter in over 2 years. I appreciate your attempts at overturning this harsh rule. I am sure I speak for many separated families.

Yes, he does. He speaks for tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of people who have been separated at our border because of this ridiculous, illogical, unscientific policy.

What else did the President say in his State of the Union Address last night? "We opened our country back up." Well, we need to tell all of the tourism industry that we have opened our country back up because the U.S. Travel Association has stated this week, just this week, that it cost over \$90 billion. This one policy has cost over \$90 billion of revenue, of income to this country in tourism, and that is why they support getting rid of this ridiculous mandate.

□ 1415

What is the Democrats' argument over there? I have heard it all already.

I see they are very smug and smiling. They bleat about democracy. They bleat on and on about democracy. Is this democracy?

Their best argument—virtually their only argument—is right here in "The Whip's Daily Preview" on the Democrat side: "House Democrats have been stalwart in their defense of following the science over playing politics with COVID-19. The decision to end vaccine requirements for global travelers should be made by public health experts with real-time understanding of the situation. Hamstringing agencies from responding to ongoing or future threats that could impact the health and economic stability of America undermines our Nation."

They are arguing that they are not qualified to vote on laws that affect the most basic human rights of people in this country and people wishing to visit this country.

Imagine that. Working so hard to get elected, preaching about democracy, and then getting here and saying: Do you know what? I don't think we should be voting on this because, well, I think the bureaucrats are probably more qualified than we are. The science is hard.

Science is hard. That is basically their argument.

Let's take their argument. Let's listen to the scientists, the bureaucrats. What does the World Health Organization, what does this collection of global scientists, say about this policy? This is real-time because it was January 30, 2023. They had a meeting and said No. 6 in their recommendations: "Continue to adjust any remaining international travel-related measures, based on risk assessment, and to not require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 as a prerequisite for international travel."

They love global government. You think the science over there would appeal to the World Health Organization, but if that doesn't work, let's listen to our own CDC, which said in August of last year: If you are deciding to quarantine or mask or any of these other things, it shouldn't be done with respect to vaccination status.

In other words, there is enough natural immunity, and there was in August, for the CDC to say we shouldn't discriminate based on vaccination status when determining policy.

I will just close with this: Let's not be hypocrites. We were all in this room last night, hundreds of us, with hundreds of visitors, and none of us were under a vaccine mandate.

Repeal this vaccine mandate. Vote for H.R. 185 and support the bill.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a report from the WHO Director-General, and a recommendation from the CDC for managing SARS-CoV-2 exposure.

Mr. Chair, I enter into the RECORD two articles:

STATEMENT ON THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH REGULATIONS (2005) EMERGENCY COMMITTEE REGARDING THE CORONAVIRUS DISEASE (COVID-19) PANDEMIC

The WHO Director-General has the pleasure of transmitting the Report of the fourteenth meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) (IHR) Emergency Committee regarding the coronavirus 2019 disease (COVID-19).

Continue to adjust any remaining international travel-related measures, based on risk assessment, and to not require proof of vaccination against COVID-19 as a prerequisite for international travel.

Continue to support research for improved vaccines that reduce transmission and have broad applicability, as well as research to understand the full spectrum, incidence and impact of post COVID-19 condition, and to develop relevant integrated care pathways.

#### MANAGING SARS-CoV-2 EXPOSURES

CDC now recommends case investigation and contact tracing only in health care settings and certain high-risk congregate settings. In all other circumstances, public health efforts can focus on case notification and provision of information and resource to exposed persons about access to testing. Persons who have had recent confirmed or suspected exposure to an infected person should wear a mask for 10 days around others when indoors in public and should receive testing  $\geq 5$  days after exposure (or sooner, if they are symptomatic), irrespective of their vaccination status. In light of high population levels of anti-SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence (7, 16), and to limit social and economic impacts, quarantine of exposed persons is no longer recommended, regardless of vaccination status.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, again, I am not surprised, I guess, but when the gentleman from Kentucky talks about human rights and then he gives the lists of the countries that don't mandate vaccines that include Iran, Russia, Cuba, Syria, and China, these are not countries that care much about human rights.

As I said before in the Rules Committee, Republicans always talk about America first. We have the best healthcare and public health experts in the world, in my opinion. The CDC is so much better than any of the healthcare organizations, in my opinion, certainly better than our adversaries like Russia, Cuba, or China, but even for the other countries that are mentioned.

I understand the World Health Organization is out there, but I think we should be listening to the public health experts in our country and not worrying about some of these other countries that are adversaries.

I would be very concerned about people coming from places like Russia, China, and Cuba not being vaccinated because of the lack of attention to public health in those countries.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), my good friend.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 185, which will lift the CDC's burdensome mandates for international travelers into the United States.

Frankly, I can't believe the mandate is still here, but I talk to my constituents who have family that want to come to the United States, international travelers, and they can't come because they don't want to take the vaccine. That is their right.

We need to lift this. I thank my colleague, Mr. MASSIE, for his leadership on this particular piece of legislation.

This past week, my colleagues and I on the Energy and Commerce Committee have held hearings and markups focused on competitiveness versus China, ensuring American companies lead the globe.

This morning, we also held a long-overdue Oversight Committee hearing with the CDC, and I challenged them to think of the impacts their mandates are having on the travel and tourism section.

The Biden administration's onerous vaccine mandates for workers, citizens, and international travelers have been disastrous for our economy and have done very little to mitigate public health concerns, as my colleague stated.

Republicans have made it clear: We are tired of mandates and overregulation. This legislation will remove these mandates so travel can resume into the country and so we can make our Nation competitive again on the international stage.

We have the Brand USA program that advertises our Nation's hidden treasures. They are everywhere, but the travel sector hasn't been able to be fully unleashed, thanks to the CDC. We know, historically, that the industry in my home State of Florida—but it is not just my home State—has accounted for more than \$80 billion in revenue and 1½ million jobs annually.

Let's get our economy back on track. This makes so much sense, this particular bill. Let's remove this ridiculous mandate.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, my friends on the other side of the aisle seem unconcerned about the threat the COVID-19 virus poses to public health. They have shown that consistently over the time of the pandemic.

They have dismissed the severity of the virus. The previous Republican Party President dismissed it, too, and tried to claim that you could just solve it with a light bulb going into your body somewhere or drinking some type of Clorox.

They have dismissed the science behind masking and social distancing. They have dismissed vaccinations. They have dismissed peer-reviewed science. They have condemned Dr. Fauci, who is an American hero who

guided us through this pandemic that cost the lives of over 1 million Americans dying of COVID over the last 3 years. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention says that there are over 500 Americans dying each day from COVID.

I believe in science. I believe in specialists. I believe in doctors. CDC is the specialist here.

My colleagues on the other side are very concerned about China, but now they are not concerned about China—which has one of the biggest COVID problems of any place in the globe—having visitors come to our Nation without having been vaccinated.

This is a threat to the health of the American people directly from China. They are concerned about China, but not now.

I would submit most of my colleagues on the other side are vaccinated against COVID, vaccinated against polio, vaccinated against all types of diseases, but all of a sudden, they don't want to give any authority to the CDC to protect us from countries that don't have vaccination requirements.

Science first. Dollars and sense, s-e-n-s-e. That is what we ought to have.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, before I yield, I want to point out that this doesn't do anything to undo the restrictions on people traveling from China.

As a matter of fact, the Rules Committee made an amendment in order that will pass today, and I hope my friends will support it. That will reiterate that this doesn't do anything to undo the restrictions on people traveling from China.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), my good friend and vice chair of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 185.

As a physician, I do support the science, and the previous speaker is on the wrong side of it. He is ignoring the science.

It is unfortunate but not surprising that the Biden administration is failing to acknowledge the foolishness of requiring proof of COVID-19 vaccination for international travelers.

We know that while the current COVID-19 vaccines are highly effective at preventing severe disease and death, they don't provide sterilizing immunity and prevent vaccinated individuals from becoming infected or from transmitting COVID-19.

I want to say that I am vaccinated. I wish everyone would be.

Thus, continuing to impose this vaccine mandate causes unnecessary harm to our Nation's tourism industry, which has already suffered for more than 3 years. Beyond that, it damages our image as a nation whose laws and policies are guided by the principles of freedom and backed by science.

President Biden's continued insistence that international visitors be vaccinated appears to be virtue signaling,

in my view, because the scientific evidence does not support the claim that vaccination prevents the spread of the virus.

Our neighbors in Canada and Mexico, our allies across the Atlantic in the U.K. and France, and many more countries around the world are declining to require proof of vaccination for international travelers.

In addition to ignoring the needs of business and communities that rely on tourism, these requirements make us look ludicrous on the world stage.

For example, last year, we blocked the number one-ranked tennis player in the world, Novak Djokovic, from entering the country to compete in the U.S. Open. Do we really think that blocking one individual from the country is going to have any real impact on the spread of COVID-19?

I strongly believe COVID-19 vaccines are safe and very effective at reducing harmful effects of the virus. Again, I recommend vaccination, but it is nonsensical that we are driving away foreign nationals who want to compete, visit loved ones, conduct business, or simply take in the amazing sites our country has to offer. That is why I support this legislation and why I believe the U.S. needs to lift this requirement now.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), a member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, our healthcare workforce is stretched to capacity after having spent now 3 years on the front lines of the pandemic, and add to that recent spikes in RSV and flu.

Our hospitals have been overpacked, with a shortage of available beds and a real worry and sometimes a reality that there won't be room in a hospital if we get sick or injured.

Due to stress and burnout, hospitals across the country are experiencing staff shortages. What healthcare workers and hospital workers really don't need right now is more stress on an already stressed system, and that is exactly what this bill will do.

As we all know, and as I can tell you, as a pediatrician, people who are not vaccinated have a significantly higher risk of being hospitalized if they contract COVID. Why in the world would we invite people from around the world to come to visit the United States without that protection and then put our hospital systems at further risk of overcrowding and collapse? Not to mention the higher risk of getting and spreading the disease around our country or even potentially bringing new variants to our shores.

Vaccination is safe. I speak as a doctor. It is effective in keeping people out of hospitals and curbing transmission. We should rightly expect that

those traveling to the United States get immunized because we should not risk further stressing an already strained healthcare system.

It was only a few months ago when hospitals in my State, in Washington State, were full. Patients with life-threatening illnesses, bleeds, life-threatening injuries had to be flown to distant cities to get care. Whatever we can do to prevent that from happening again, we should do. Making sure we get vaccinated and insisting that those visiting our country get vaccinated help do just that.

Public health decisions should be made by doctors and public health professionals based on data, not by Members of Congress for political expediency.

This bill is a political stunt. It has no basis in science. It fails to recognize the reality that our hospitals are facing right now and that any one of us might face if a loved one needs a hospital bed and that bed is not available. Please leave public health decisions to public health professionals.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

Ms. Schrier moves to recommit the bill H.R. 185 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:  
**SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services submits to Congress a certification that such provisions will not result in—

- (1) a decrease in hospital bed capacity in the United States;
- (2) a reduction in health care resources available in the United States; or
- (3) any staffing shortage for health care providers in the United States.

□ 1430

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my friend and colleague from Kentucky for his leadership on this bill.

I just want to remind everyone here today that the year is 2023, it is not 2020, and yet, many of our COVID policies are still based on numbers from almost 3 years ago.

This vaccine requirement for international travelers is a prime example. Countries all around the world realize this and are rolling back their own border restrictions.

I also point out that this vaccine requirement is not part of the emergency declarations that are scheduled to end in May.

This means that vaccine requirements could still stay in effect for an indefinite period of time. Come May, it is possible we won't even have a public health emergency at all.

We won't have a national emergency, but our friends and family from, say, for example, Canada would still have to

show proof of vaccination when flying in to visit their relatives.

We don't even require our own citizens to be vaccinated or show a negative test, so why would we do that and create a different standard for folks that are visiting?

This only causes confusion for Americans who are told one minute they are safe and don't have to fear COVID-19, and yet, we continue these pandemic requirements.

I am here today to tell the American people that despite the mixed messages emanating from the White House, I believe we are safe, and in the words of President Biden, the pandemic is, in fact, over.

I am proud to cosponsor this commonsense bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 185.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, again, the previous Republican speaker said that we are confusing the public, and I think it is they that are, in fact, confusing the public.

We are hearing all kinds of anti-vaccine misinformation on the floor and in Rules, and I just think it is important to note that CDC, FDA, and nearly all health professionals are near unanimous in recommending that people get vaccinated and that vaccines are safe and effective.

I just think it is very damaging for the public to constantly hear from Members on the other side of the aisle about potential problems with vaccination because then people think that they shouldn't get vaccinated.

I know what your position is, that you don't want it to be mandated which, of course, I disagree with because of what public health experts say for foreign travelers, but please don't continue to give misinformation.

There are over 500 people that die every day from COVID. COVID is still here. COVID continues to spread. The variants could come up and spread at any moment, so we should not give the impression that people should not take vaccines.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), a member of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 185 to end the international travel COVID vaccine mandate.

I am a doctor, and unlike my colleague on the other side of the aisle, I am also a former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, so I am speaking for public health.

The vast majority of Americans are either vaccinated or have natural immunity. There is no recognition of natural immunity by continuing the COVID-19 vaccine mandate for travelers into the United States.

This is, as previously alluded, not 2020. It is 2023. This timely measure

nullifies the CDC's order that restricts noncitizen entry into the United States unless the traveler can prove they are vaccinated against COVID-19. It doesn't say to prove immunity or prove testing negative.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to move forward. Entry restrictions were necessary during the early stages and the height of the pandemic, but that was when we, as a Nation, were still learning the details of the virus and experiencing soaring death and hospitalization rates.

Now, over 95 percent of Americans have various forms of immunity, whether from vaccination or prior infection, and health professionals have deep knowledge of the coronavirus that has led to multiple vaccines and therapeutics.

People have returned to work, children to school, and Americans have resumed international travel at prepandemic rates.

Some of the countries with the most stringent lockdown and protocols, Canada, Australia, and Germany, all have eliminated their severe entry restrictions. All have suspended their vaccine requirements. It is time that we, as a Nation, do the same.

This does not mean that we do not still have circulating virus. We are aware of that, but it is time for the mandate for travelers entering the United States to end.

Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree that the pandemic is over. President Biden even said so himself.

House Republicans will continue to move our country past the pandemic, which is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues as a public health professional to vote "yes."

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, Mr. MASSIE, for introducing this bill.

I am listening to some of the arguments on the Democrat side here today, and I hear about vaccine conspiracies. I am not hearing that over here. In fact, I am vaccinated. I have the boosters. I think it was important to do that.

I am proud of what we were able to get done through Operation Warp Speed. We protected many Americans. But I don't understand the argument that this has anything to do with vaccine conspiracies.

I was contacted by a constituent, Hunter McBryde, who informed me that this particular mandate, that almost no one else in the world has in place, is keeping his family separated. This is keeping his kids from seeing their grandparents.

He is from the district that I represent in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He happened to be studying in Australia

for his Ph.D. when the pandemic started. His wife is an Australian citizen. They share three beautiful children.

Because of this shortsighted policy, Hunter and his family have been unable to move back home to Lancaster County to be with the rest of their extended family here simply because of the family's vaccination and immigration status.

I contacted the CDC on behalf of the family and was told that the agency still believes that COVID vaccines, not testing, not quarantining, are necessary to protect public safety, despite the fact that President Biden has said the pandemic is over.

Mr. Chairman, 147 countries, including Canada, U.K., Italy, France, Australia, South Korea, and many others are totally open to tourists, regardless of their vaccination status. Another 57 nations allow tourists to take a COVID test or quarantine if they are unvaccinated.

The worst of this pandemic is clearly over. There is no reason that the CDC should continue to discriminate against tourists or residents who, for health or religious reasons, do not wish to receive the COVID vaccine.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania—let me just make it clear. I have not used the word "conspiracy." I am not suggesting there is a conspiracy on the other side of the aisle.

What I just resent is the fact that I do not hear any of my colleagues on the other side, on the Republican side, get up and say that vaccines are safe and effective, and people should take them.

We had an amendment by Mr. TAKANO before the Rules Committee, which would have made it clear that nothing in this bill shall be construed to cast doubt on the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines.

This would send a strong message to us that we should come together on a bipartisan basis and make clear that this bill is not intended to disparage vaccines and that the House of Representatives stands in support of science and reason, but my colleagues refuse to say that.

It is not a question of a conspiracy. It is a question of I believe it is your obligation to tell the American people that they should be vaccinated or at least that the vaccines are safe and effective in most cases, but you don't do that.

So the misconception is out there. It is not a conspiracy, but it is a misconception that vaccines are not safe.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. Again, this is the third in a series of bills over the last 2 weeks that tries to roll back the protections that the Federal Gov-

ernment has put in place to try to stop the pandemic.

Now, granted, the pandemic—we have had a lot of success. I mean, President Biden for the last 2 years in terms of promoting vaccines and testing and all kinds of public health protections, COVID is on the wane. The number of people dying, the number of people hospitalized, all that is on the wane. He has said that he is planning on May 11 to lift the public health emergency.

But all I have been saying, and all the Democrats have been saying for the last 2 weeks on all these bills, is let's go by the science.

Let's be reasonable about this. Let's not assume that we can let foreign travelers in and them not be vaccinated.

Let's not assume that it is a good thing for public health workers to be unvaccinated. Let's not make a decision to end the public health emergency immediately.

Let's leave it up to the agencies and the experts, which again, I believe, are the best in the world. I am not interested in what Russia does or Cuba does or some of these other countries that are mentioned because we have the best experts in the world. If anybody denies that I will prove it to them that we do.

The bottom line is that as Democrats, we understand that the pandemic is on the wane, but we don't want to rush to make decisions or force decisions, if you will, on our public health experts that could be detrimental or make it difficult and tie their hands.

One of the things that is in this bill—and there are going to be a series of amendments now to deal with this—is to say that not only is this vaccine mandate eliminated but that the CDC can't even make any other types of mandates like that in the future.

That is very dangerous to tie their hands when we don't know exactly where COVID and the variants are going to be going in the next few months or the next few years. It is a mistake to do that.

So we will hear about some of these amendments that I think are really important, but the bottom line is this is a bad bill.

It continues this policy of basically eliminating the protections that we have been trying to put in place, that we have had in place, and that have helped us get beyond the COVID pandemic, for the most part.

I urge my colleagues, you know, for the sake of science, for the sake of helping people, for the sake of public health to vote "no" on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I heard several Members that were talking, saying that they were vaccinated and encouraged people to be vaccinated.

I actually did my vaccination on Facebook to encourage people to be vaccinated.

The question is: Is it a choice or a requirement to move forward?

So I am not here to disparage the vaccine at all. I just think it should be the people's choice.

To clarify—this was brought up, and I want to reiterate again—this does not affect any of the entry requirements that have been put on people coming from China. There will be an amendment in the package to reinforce that it doesn't do anything to move forward.

We had a hearing earlier today, and for the first time, I heard there is actually a plan to try to unwind the emergency pandemic. That is the first time I heard of that. We have been asking for that for a year.

We want to move these bills forward because other countries have started opening up. Other countries have moved forward.

We heard the President say the pandemic is over. We heard the President say in this Chamber last night that COVID doesn't run our lives anymore. So we need to do our proper role of oversight.

I will point out that if there is another strain of COVID—when it says that not only does it undo the mandate, it will also undo any similar mandates, it is only for COVID. So if there is another kind of pathogen, unfortunately—hopefully not—that comes into our country, it can be addressed.

We can come together. We came together when COVID first broke in 2020. I remember flying back on an airplane that had three people on it right in the heart of COVID so we could come back and cast a vote.

We all came together and did that. We will rise to the occasion as we move forward.

The question is: Can we get back to normal?

This is a bill that brings us back to normal.

It has nothing to do with the effectiveness of the vaccine. As I said, I took mine on Facebook so people would see that I felt it was safe. I just don't want to force somebody else to do it.

This is an opportunity for us to end this mandate and continue to work because I want to work with my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee as we unwind this pandemic before May 11, so that we do it together, and we do it in a way that we recognize COVID is still here.

When they say it is not a pandemic, it is endemic. That doesn't mean it has gone away. It means we still have to mitigate and deal with it.

There will be opportunities for us to work in a bipartisan way and do so as we move forward out of this emergency order, which was last week's bill.

But in this bill, it is time for us to move forward like the rest of the world, as well.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill. There will be some amendments also to move forward on as we debate later today.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 185.

Detroit Metropolitan Airport is a leading international hub with over 1,100 flights daily to and from four continents. Every year, the airport welcomes more than 36 million passengers from across the world.

Southeast Michigan was hit hard by the coronavirus, and orders like the COVID-19 vaccine requirement for global travelers entering the United States helped mitigate its further spread into our communities.

Our nation is entering a new phase of our recovery, but COVID-19 remains a real public health threat. The emergence of new variants globally continues to put our own nation at risk.

That's why legislation we are considering today is misguided. These decisions must be rooted in science and made by our Nation's leading public health experts, not politicians.

We know the best way to defeat this pandemic is for people within the United States and around the world to get vaccinated, and this legislation is contrary to this goal.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 185, to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of Covid-19 vaccination for foreign travelers.

H.R. 185 is hasty attempt to reverse the order issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention without any proper planning or preparation.

The Amended Order Implementing Presidential Proclamation on Advancing the Safe Resumption of Global Travel During the COVID-19 Pandemic was first published on April 7, 2022, and was implemented to save lives.

The CDC order imposes necessary restrictions on the entry of noncitizens into the United States by air travel unless they are fully vaccinated against COVID-19 or otherwise attest that they will take public health measures to prevent the spread of the disease.

Similar restrictions have been implemented and enforced worldwide, and countries like Thailand have had to reimplement such restrictions after lifting them.

Now is not the time to roll back protections, only to be in a place where we will need to reimpose more onerous and unwanted lockdowns and shutdowns across the country.

Yet, H.R. 185 would nullify any successor or subsequent orders that require foreign persons traveling by air to show proof of a COVID-19 vaccination as a condition of entry, as well as prohibit the use of federal funds to administer or enforce such a requirement.

Mr. Chair, the wellbeing of the American People should hold the utmost importance and any act against their health and wellbeing should be strongly condemned.

Since March 2020, life in Houston—like most of the world—has been upended.

Houston, Texas is the 4th largest city in the country and is one of the most racially and ethnically diverse cities in the United States.

In addition to Houston being a culturally diverse city and home to international students, residents, and families from all over the world, Houston also serves as an international hub for millions of people all over the world who

travel to my city every year for both leisure and business.

According to the Houston First Corporation, a record 22.3 million people from around the world visited Houston in 2018.

Notably, the 2023 Houston Rodeo season, scheduled for Feb. 28–March 19, is the largest rodeo in the world and contributes significantly to our city's economy. In 2022, this event attracted over 2.4 million international travelers from around the world.

Despite the senseless and disingenuous politicization of the COVID-19 vaccine, it has and continues to save countless lives—particularly in my home state and internationally rich travel hub of Houston, Texas.

In Houston, specifically Harris County, there have been 1,058,476 confirmed COVID-19 cases, 7,839 active cases, 1,041,939 recovered, and 8,589 deaths. Furthermore, Texas as a state has recorded 8.24 million cases and 93,366 deaths.

In the United States, there have been 102 million confirmed case and 1.11 million deaths.

And across the globe, there have been 671 million confirmed cases and 6.83 million deaths.

These statistics serve as a harrowing reminder of the gravity of this epidemic and the caution we should be taking in ensuring preventative responses and remaining vigilant against the spread of COVID-19.

Rolling back critical vaccination policies put in place to protect Americans through hasty measures such as H.R. 185, undermines the national mission and unified efforts nationwide to prevent future cases infiltrating our communities.

While progress has certainly been made in protecting Americans from this deadly virus, we cannot stand for the erosion of such progress through ill-conceived and politicized measures.

As we continue to make strides to prevent and eradicate current and future variants plaguing our cities, states, nation, and world, let it be known that H.R. 185 would only serve to disregard the health and well-being of all Americans, foolishly jeopardizing our lives and the ongoing fight to keep everyone healthy and safe.

Instead of halting vital funding and vaccine policies for international travelers, without a plan or forethought of the disastrous impact that will inevitably result, it is imperative that we stand together in planning and preparing for smart policy shifts that will allow our country to effectively and safely ease back into some sense of normalcy.

Anything less is an abdication of our governmental duties and an insult and danger to the welfare of all those we are sworn to serve.

With strong opposition to this bill, I urge my Republican colleagues to step back and actually work with us to lay forward common sense implementations of care and safety for our fellow Americans.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 185

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*



**SECTION 1. TERMINATING CDC REQUIREMENT FOR PROOF OF COVID-19 VACCINATION FOR FOREIGN TRAVELERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the air travel vaccination requirement for foreign travelers shall have no force or effect.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON FUNDING.**—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal funds may be used to administer, implement, or enforce the air travel vaccination requirement for foreign travelers.

(c) **AIR TRAVEL VACCINATION REQUIREMENT FOR FOREIGN TRAVELERS.**—In this Act, the term “air travel vaccination requirement for foreign travelers” refers to the requirement specified in—

(1) the order issued by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention entitled “Amended Order Implementing Presidential Proclamation on Advancing the Safe Resumption of Global Travel During the COVID-19 Pandemic” and published in the Federal Register on April 7, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 20405 et seq.), for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for air travelers who are covered individuals (as defined in such order); or

(2) any successor or subsequent order of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention requiring foreign persons traveling by air to show proof of COVID-19 vaccination as a condition on entering the United States.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 118-3. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1445

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-3.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 22, add the following:

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the authority of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to mandate vaccination requirements against any other disease for noncitizens who are nonimmigrants seeking to enter the United States by air travel for the sake of public health.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I know that some of my colleagues on the other side may think a degree from google.com makes them a public health expert, but the truth is it doesn't.

I am sick and tired of coming down here to the floor wasting time on anti-vaxxer junk science dug up from the

darkest corners of the internet and brought to the House floor. Once again, it should be no surprise to anybody, we are bringing this bill to the floor in which lots of questions have been raised without a single hearing, without a markup.

By the way, the Energy and Commerce Committee today is having a hearing but, unfortunately, this bill is not the subject of that hearing because here we are on the House floor.

The amendment I am offering today is simple. All we are saying is the CDC should continue to have the authority in the future to demand that visitors to the United States show proof of vaccination for diseases other than COVID. It is not complicated. It is not a radical idea.

We already require multiple vaccines for people who are immigrating or seeking refuge in this country for diseases like smallpox, polio, measles, and mumps. Why? Because they work.

My colleagues on the other side seem to think that if there is a polio or smallpox outbreak in another country, they don't want the CDC requiring proof of vaccination for people traveling from those countries to the United States. But using their logic, that is where we are headed.

We have wasted 2 weeks now on these ridiculous anti-vaxxer conspiracy theory bills. We have Members that watched a few YouTube videos, and they think they know more about all the medical research than the experts on this subject. They think they know more than all the scientists, all the doctors, and all the public health professionals. It is embarrassing and, quite frankly, it is alarming.

But what is even more disappointing is that we have doctors in Congress who, shamefully, stood in silence while anti-science and anti-safety rhetoric has run rampant.

The majority says that this bill doesn't apply to other vaccines. Well, if they believe that, they should vote for this amendment and clarify their intent.

So let's just put this out in the open. This bill isn't about COVID vaccines. It is about disinformation. It is about conspiracy theories that, quite frankly, confuse people and can pose a threat to the people of this country. This doesn't put politics over science, it puts science over politics.

I don't want anything in this bogus bill to be used to diminish the CDC's authority to respond to public health emergencies in the future. The purpose of the CDC is to prevent the spread of disease in this country, and we should let them do their job.

I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is targeted to COVID-19, and has nothing to do with other diseases.

Further, CDC does not have clear authority to mandate vaccination requirements. The order referenced in legislation is implementing a Presidential proclamation and not a standing authority that CDC has.

Further, almost every single one of CDC's overreaches in authority have been challenged. CDC is still fighting for their ability to require masks in public transit stations in court. They are still fighting that.

Why would we adopt this amendment and signal that they have authority to mandate vaccinations in the future?

I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield to the primary sponsor of the underlying legislation, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

I find it somewhat ironic that the other side is complaining about the process during the debate on the amendment that the other side gets to offer by virtue of a decision in the Rules Committee to open up this process. So this is the process.

The gentleman from Indiana is correct. It is not a given; it has not been established that the CDC has this authority. There is no need for us to legislate beyond the intent of this bill.

The intent of this bill is to eliminate a Presidential order about a COVID vaccine for international travelers. There is no need for us, in this bill, to try and give the CDC additional authority. In fact, the bill is quiet on whether they have this authority, and that is a subject that is being debated in the courts right now.

I also want to point out that the order, as well as the gentleman's amendment, doesn't apply to immigrants. The order that the President has put in place on visitors doesn't apply to illegal immigrants to this United States, and neither would this gentleman's amendment.

So I think when you talk about science and logic, why is it that somebody who is coming here legally would be more of a threat than somebody who is coming here illegally?

So I urge a “no” on the amendment, and a “yes” on the bill, but mostly, certainly a “no” on this amendment.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I am just asking, urging that we clarify that the anti-vax rhetoric we hear on the other side of the aisle doesn't apply to other vaccines beyond COVID. There is a trust issue here.

I will give you an example. Last night, when the President asked that the Republicans not vote to cut Social Security and Medicare, you all said you weren't going to do that.

Yet, we look today, we see statements from people like Senator MIKE LEE who said that his objective is to phase out Social Security; to pull it up by the roots and get rid of it.

The Republican Study Committee released a budget that calls for

privatizing Social Security and raising the eligibility ages for Social Security and Medicare.

We have had Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM suggest raising the age for Social Security and cutting benefits for seniors, while making them pay more. I can go on; RICK SCOTT introduced a bill that would sunset Social Security, so there is a trust issue.

Quite frankly, in order for me to agree with the gentleman, I would have to forget everything that I heard in the Rules Committee last night.

So this simply says that your anti-vax rhetoric does not apply to other health emergencies and other vaccines. This is about protecting the safety and well-being of the people of this country.

Again, if you had a hearing, and if you brought the CDC head up and asked these questions, maybe we would all feel a little bit more comfortable, but you are rushing this to the floor because you are looking for a sound bite; you are looking for a moment on Tucker Carlson or whatever, or more Twitter followers or whatever.

We are interested in responsible legislating, so we would appreciate a reinsurance that, in fact, your anti-vax rhetoric doesn't apply to other vaccines.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-3.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 22, add the following:

#### SEC. 2. REPORT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall submit a report to Congress on the number of visitors denied entry under the order specified in subsection (c)(1) during the period beginning on April 7, 2022, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in favor of my amendment which will require the CDC to produce a report to Congress on the number of visitors de-

nied entry under the Biden administration's vaccine mandate for all incoming international air travelers and visitors to the United States.

This simple, straightforward amendment will provide transparency surrounding this ludicrous and unscientific vaccine mandate put in place by Joe Biden's bureaucrats.

This unnecessary CDC rule has made everyday life so much harder for so many people; from tearing apart family reunifications and forcing loved ones to die alone, without their relatives by their side, to punishing companies overseas for doing business with America.

Just a few short stories my congressional office has come across include: The mother of a Dutch tourist who died on the Appalachian Trail, was unable to come home to the United States to collect her dead son's body; a woman's fiancé who lives in Canada has been unable to visit her on American soil for the past 3 years; a man working for a company in the United Kingdom who is unable to travel to the United States for business meetings; and a family in New Hampshire with Canadian in-laws has been unable to have Canadian family members visit for Christmas in the United States since COVID started.

My amendment will require the CDC to account for these stories and countless others who have felt the negative ramifications of this rule. It will also provide transparency and allow congressional oversight of the consequences of this vaccine mandate.

Despite Joe Biden stating the pandemic is over, he has refused to lift this mandate. Even Canada has lifted its vaccine mandate for incoming U.S. air travelers.

Other than a few countries around the world run by dictators, the United States of America is literally the only country left that is imposing this unscientific and immoral COVID vaccine mandate on our visitors. Of course, if you cross our southern border illegally, there is no such mandate; and we know of about 5 million who have done just that.

Simply put, COVID is over. It is time for us to rejoin the free world.

I thank my friend and colleague, Representative THOMAS MASSIE, for his work to end yet another vaccine mandate. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly support it.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The reason I am opposed to the amendment is because I don't think it is necessary or is even helpful to the

issue at hand. It talks about a report on the number of visitors denied entry under this policy.

The fact of the matter is that, on the Democratic side, what we are concerned about is the public health. If the gentlewoman wanted to have an amendment that said there would be a report that provides us with public health data to justify lifting the mandate, I could see something like that because the bottom line here is we are concerned about the science.

The CDC says that this mandate is necessary to protect Americans, to reduce the COVID cases, to make sure that people don't get sick and that more people are hospitalized and be taxing on our public health system. So I don't see how this amendment that talks about the number of visitors gets to any of that.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

□ 1500

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN OF MAINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-3.

Mr. GOLDEN of Maine. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ms. PEREZ, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike "specified in—" and all that follows through "(1) the order" line 9 and insert "specified in the order".

Page 2, line 17, strike ";; or" and insert a period.

Page 2, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 22.

Page 2, after line 22, add the following:

(d) NONAPPLICABILITY TO SUBSEQUENT ORDERS.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any successor or subsequent order of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to that specified in subsection (c) which requires foreign persons traveling by air to show proof of COVID-19 vaccination as a condition on entering the United States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN of Maine. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of Ms. GLUESENKAMP PEREZ of Washington to ensure that



the underlying bill does not risk the public health and safety of the American people in the future.

Like many of my colleagues across the aisle, I support ending the COVID-19 vaccine requirement for international travelers at this time but doing so in the interest of our constituents' safety in mind, first and foremost.

Today, this COVID-19 vaccine requirement for international travelers is no longer necessary. In fact, it has become an unnecessary barrier for visitors who would boost local economies and who want to visit with friends and family and reunite with loved ones. However, we should remember that at the beginning of the pandemic, this requirement served as an important protection for our constituents. It would be shortsighted to move to hamstring similar future actions, if necessary.

That is why Ms. GLUESINKAMP PEREZ and I support this amendment, which strikes the prohibition on successor or subsequent requirements for air travelers so that future administrations, whether they be Democrat or Republican, have the tools that they need to protect the American people.

We are not here to subject the health and safety of our constituents to political whims here in Washington.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to work with my colleague on this amendment, and I urge all of our colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, it is clear that the Biden administration has pushed its authorities past reasonable interpretation during the COVID-19 pandemic.

With everything from eviction moratoriums and student loan forgiveness to vaccine and mask mandates being challenged and defeated in court, it is clear that the Biden administration needs the oversight of Congress.

The prohibition on rulemaking makes sure the CDC cannot impose a future COVID-19 vaccine requirement on international travelers and that the Biden administration would need to come to Congress for CDC to take such action in the future.

H.R. 185 is a commonsense bill. As President Biden himself has stated: The "pandemic is over." And, as he announced last week, the White House would end the current COVID-19 public health emergency effective May 11, 2023.

We are currently one of the only countries still requiring any such vaccine mandate. The CDC itself has also acknowledged the vaccine does not prevent transmission. Why then are we still requiring a vaccine to enter our borders for legal travelers? Again, reminding everyone that for illegal travelers entering across the southern border, we are not requiring it.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 118-3.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:  
**SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act may be construed to suggest that the provisions of section 1 shall effect the order issued by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention entitled "Requirements for Negative Pre-Departure COVID-19 Test Results or Documentation of Recovery from COVID-19 for Aircraft Passengers Traveling to the United States From the People's Republic of China" and published in the Federal Register on January 5, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 864) for proof of negative pre-departure COVID-19 test results or documentation of recovery from COVID-19 for aircraft passengers traveling to the United States from the People's Republic of China or departing from a designated airport if such passenger has been in the People's Republic of China within the 10 days prior to departure for the United States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 185, and I thank my friend from Kentucky, Mr. MASSIE, for introducing this important piece of legislation.

We all know that the People's Republic of China has not been transparent regarding its handling of the COVID crisis.

My amendment is simple. This amendment will add language to the underlying bill to clarify that no provisions in the bill shall affect the order issued by the CDC requiring negative COVID-19 tests or proof of recovery from COVID-19 for travelers coming from the People's Republic of China.

A Bloomberg news article from last month said that: "After years of meticulously testing to find every last case of COVID-19, Chinese President Xi Jinping is now effectively looking the other way as the virus ravages the nation's 1.4 billion people."

Mr. Chair, we cannot fall asleep at the wheel when it comes to protecting

our Nation, its people, and our safety with respect to the adversarial and all-too-often nefarious actions and intentions of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I may not necessarily be opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, any effort to keep the existing protocols for China are appropriate, but I rise today with great concern about the underlying bill, H.R. 185, which is to terminate the requirement imposed by the director of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers.

It is not the CDC, based on science, that is attempting to do this, or the administration, based on the multiple levels of science, Health and Human Services, CDC, and NIH that may contribute to this decision. It is Congress, that certainly has its role of authority, but it is not authority based on science and based on knowledge.

I believe this is a hasty attempt to reverse the order issued by the Centers for Disease Control. As well, I believe it imposes important restrictions by the CDC on the entry of noncitizens into the United States by air travel unless they are fully vaccinated.

We know that there are discussions going on about ending certain protocols with COVID-19. But as the President said last night, we lost a million Americans. People are still mourning their loved ones. We understand, with that in mind, we are still seeing people die of COVID-19 and many of its, in essence, other aspects of infectious diseases, and we are seeing COVID-19 still actively exist.

People with underlying conditions suffer greatly. Restrictions have been implemented and enforced worldwide, and countries like Thailand have had to re-implement such restrictions after lifting them.

Now is not the time to go back on protections, only to be in a place where we will need to reimpose more onerous and unwanted lockdowns and shutdowns. Yet, H.R. 185 would nullify any successor or subsequent orders that require foreign persons traveling by air to show proof of COVID-19 vaccination as a condition of entry, as well as prohibit the use of Federal funds to administer and enforce such a requirement.

Mr. Chair, this is not logical or sensible. This is a country of over 300 million persons. Again, this is a Nation that lost a million persons. I will say it again: People are still dying of COVID-19.

The well-being of the American people should be our first priority. Since March of 2020, I proceeded to provide

any number of testing sites and vaccination sites. We saw our hospitals teeming. We, of course, reached out to the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, as we were desperate to get tests and vaccines.

I spoke to New York hospitals and doctors who were telling me that their hallways were teeming, their operating rooms were nonexistent, because there were COVID patients everywhere. Many of us remember the stark look of the refrigerator cars not only in this Nation but around the world.

So I am hesitant that at this point we make a decision on the floor of the House, not a scientific report, not a hearing in a committee, to be able to suggest that we could go ahead and remove this particular health caution protection.

Again, COVID-19 cases have been 1,058,000 confirmed in our area, 7,839 active cases now, and 1 million persons recovered. There have been 8,589 deaths. Texas, as a State, has recorded 8.24 million cases and 93,366 deaths.

We are a border State, and so we have the opportunity for people to come in from foreign countries, as well as South and Central America, who come into the United States, and I am saying through legal travel. So it doesn't make sense to go to this length and to do it without further study, further science, and as well for the recognition of the importance of the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, Health and Human Services, and the President of the United States, who is the leader of this Nation.

So in working with the executive, I believe that we should give them the opportunity to work constructively and to be able to give the right kind of guidance that will protect all of us. We should not precipitously try to overcome a disease that is evident as a major killer of Americans.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, just a few days ago, we saw the People's Republic of China send a high-altitude surveillance balloon over our airspace spanning almost the entire continental United States. No one believes the government of China's ludicrous explanation that this was simply a weather balloon that inadvertently went off course. If the Chinese Government is willing to make such a bald-faced lie to the world, then how can we possibly trust the information they are releasing regarding the current COVID crisis in China?

The easy answer is: We can't. Because we can't trust the Chinese Government to be transparent and honest about the scope of their current COVID crisis, we must take appropriate precautions. Continuing to test travelers from China is essential to our national safety. A vote for this amendment is a vote in favor of holding China account-

able and ensuring the safety of our Nation and its people.

In closing, I urge Members to vote "yes" on my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 118-3.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:  
**SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The provisions of section 1 shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services submits to Congress a certification that such provisions will not result in an increase in hospitalizations due to COVID-19.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer amendment No. 5 to H.R. 185.

The decision to change COVID-19 vaccine requirements for global travelers into the United States should not be made by Members of Congress but instead by public health experts.

Colleagues, if we must continue with this reckless bill that puts politics over science by replacing guidance from our public health experts with harmful ideology at the expense of our communities, our hospitals, and our health, then I would ask for your support for my amendment.

Knowing that other countries have different health standards, have little access to vaccines for COVID, why would you risk the number of hospital beds that are currently available for yourselves, your families, your community that you represent, why would you risk that to allow visitors who are traveling into the United States to not show the bare minimum of having had a vaccine?

My amendment would require that the Secretary of Health and Human Services certify that the end of the COVID-19 vaccination requirement for foreign air travelers will not result in an increase in U.S. hospitalizations due to this deadly virus.

We do not want to threaten the progress that we have made in our fight against the COVID-19 pandemic and push hospitals, healthcare providers, and public health resources past their breaking points again.

COVID-19 is still a public health threat, with new variants of concern having emerged globally and entering the U.S. every single day.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to please, if you must move forward with this bill, vote in support of this commonsense amendment to protect our constituents, our hospitals, and our healthcare system.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I want to reiterate, as a physician, I believe the vaccines are safe and effective, and I would hope that people can make the personal choice to get vaccinated. It should be just that, their personal choice, not the choice of the Federal Government.

The CDC itself has acknowledged the vaccine does not prevent transmission, so termination of this burdensome and unnecessary mandate should not play any role in the increase in hospitalizations.

Based on the current science and what we know regarding how COVID-19 spreads, any individual person should have the right to choose whether to get the vaccine or not.

Further, we have seen that President Biden and Secretary Becerra are unwilling to relinquish any power or authority from the COVID-19 pandemic, leaving in order ridiculous guidance long past the date indicated it is necessary or useful. I have no doubt Secretary Becerra would refuse to certify this, so a vote for this amendment would delay or even prevent totally the repeal of this ridiculous mandate.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chair, I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE) having assumed the chair, Mr. KILEY, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union,

reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 185) to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LEE of Florida) at 4 p.m.

### TERMINATING CDC REQUIREMENT FOR PROOF OF COVID-19 VACCINATION FOR FOREIGN TRAVELERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 97 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 185.

Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1600

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes, with Mr. BACON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 118-3 by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) had been postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 118-3 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. ROSE of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 5 by Mrs. TORRES of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-3 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 222, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

#### AYES—210

Adams	Garcia, Robert	Pallone
Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Panetta
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Pappas
Auchincloss	Gomez	Pascarell
Balint	Gonzalez,	Payne
Barragan	Vicente	Pelosi
Beatty	Gottheimer	Peltola
Bera	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Beyer	Grijalva	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Blumenauer	Hayes	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Bonamici	Himes	Plaskett
Bowman	Horsford	Porter
Boyle (PA)	Houlihan	Pressley
Brown	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Huffman	Raskin
Bush	Ivey	Ross
Caraveo	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Jackson (NC)	Ruppersberger
Cardenas	Jackson Lee	Ryan
Carson	Jacobs	Sablan
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Salinas
Cartwright	Jeffries	Sánchez
Caspar	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Case	Kahnenger-Dove	Scanlon
Casten	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Keating	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Cherfilus-	Khanna	Scholten
McCormick	Kildee	Schrier
Chu	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Ciulline	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Cohen	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Costa	Levin	Spanberger
Courtney	Lieu	Stansbury
Craig	Lofgren	Stanton
Crockett	Lynch	Stevens
Crow	Magaziner	Strickland
Cuellar	Manning	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Matsui	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McBath	Takano
Davis (NC)	McCollum	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Meeks	Titus
DelBene	Menendez	Tlaib
Deluzio	Meng	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Tonko
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Morelle	Torres (NY)
Escobar	Moskowitz	Trahan
Eshoo	Moulton	Trone
Espallat	Mrvan	Underwood
Evans	Mullin	Vargas
Fletcher	Nadler	Vasquez
Foster	Napolitano	Veasey
Foushee	Neal	Velázquez
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Wasserman
Frost	Nickel	Schultz
Gallego	Norton	
Garamendi	Ocasio-Cortez	
Garcia (TX)	Omar	

Waters  
Watson Coleman

Wexton  
Wild

Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

#### NOES—222

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Garbarino	Mills
Allen	Garcia, Mike	Molinaro
Amodei	Gimenez	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Arrington	Gonzalez-Colón	Moore (AL)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Baird	Gosar	Murphy
Balderson	Granger	Nehls
Banks	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Barr	Graves (MO)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Oberholte
Bergman	Griffith	Ogles
Bice	Grothman	Owens
Biggs	Guest	Palmer
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Perry
Boebert	Harris	Pfleger
Bost	Harshbarger	Posey
Brecheen	Hern	Radewagen
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Buck	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hudson	Rose
Burlison	Huizenga	Rosendale
Calvert	Issa	Rouzer
Cammack	Jackson (TX)	Roy
Carey	James	Rutherford
Carl	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Santos
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer	Jordan	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cloud	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Kiley	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kim (CA)	Smucker
Crawford	Kustoff	Spartz
Crenshaw	LaHood	Stauber
Curtis	LaLota	Steel
D'Esposito	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Davidson	Lamborn	Steil
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Stewart
DesJarlais	Latta	Strong
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Tenney
Donalds	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
Duarte	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Duncan	Lesko	Timmons
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Turner
Edwards	Loudermilk	Valadao
Ellzey	Lucas	Van Drew
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Dyne
Estes	Luna	Van Orden
Ezell	Luttrell	Wagner
Fallon	Mace	Walberg
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Waltz
Ferguson	Mann	Weber (TX)
Finstad	Massie	Webster (FL)
Fischbach	Mast	Wenstrup
Fitzgerald	McCarthy	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Fleischmann	McClain	Williams (TX)
Flood	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	McCormick	Wittman
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Womack
Scott	Meuser	Yakym
Fry	Miller (IL)	Zinke
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	
Gaetz	Miller (WV)	

#### NOT VOTING—8

□ 1624

Messrs. BURCHETT, HERN, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Messrs. BAIRD, GOODEN of Texas, WALBERG, COLE, DIAZ-BALART, VAN ORDEN, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and WESTERMAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. MATSUI changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”